

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action of June 15, 2004. Upon entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-14, 17, 19 and 21-30 have been canceled, and new Claims 31-60 have been added. Accordingly, Claims 15-16, 18, 20 and 31-60 are now pending in the application.

**Summary of Interview with the Examiner**

On August 17, 2004, applicant conducted an interview with the Examiner to discuss the patentability of the present invention. During the interview, the present invention was contrasted with the “Linkstime” reference cited by the Examiner. This discussion focused primarily on two key aspects of the present invention, each of which make the invention both novel and non-obvious in view of the prior art. In particular, the two key aspects discussed with the Examiner were (1) the unique way in which the present invention allows golf courses to provide (or post) a set of their available tee times to a hub server for online reservation by golfers, and (2) the unique manner in which the server uses the available tee times posted by the golf courses to generate an online display for prospective golfers that includes multiple tee times at each of a plurality of golf courses displayed all on a single screen. During the course of this discussion, the Examiner provided various suggestions as to specific language that could be added to the claims to more clearly define these aspects of the present invention. As a result, applicant has elected in this Amendment to cancel some of the existing claims, amend some of the existing claims, and add new claims that more clearly define the novel and non-obvious aspects of the present invention, as discussed with the Examiner.

**Rejection of Claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)**

On Page 2, Item 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by [www.linkstime.com](http://www.linkstime.com) (hereinafter referred to as ‘Linkstime’). As indicated above, applicant has canceled claim 1-14, 17, 19 and 21-30. Applicant has also

amended Claims 15-16 and 18 to more clearly define the novel and non-obvious aspects of the present invention.

**Claims 15-16, 18 and 20**

Independent Claim 15 as amended is directed to a method that (in response to receiving a web page request from a computer associated with a golf course) includes the step of “serving to the golf course computer via the communications network a tee time posting page comprising a list of future tee times at the respective golf course and a tee time input interface for selecting tee times at said golf course that are to be posted to the tee times reservations hub.” Independent Claim 15 also includes the step of “receiving, from the golf course computer via the communications network, a posting input indicating which tee times in the list of future tee times at said golf course are to be posted to the tee time reservations hub.” As discussed in applicant’s recent interview with the Examiner, Linkstime does not teach or suggest either of these elements. Accordingly, applicant submits that independent Claim 15 is patentable over Linkstime for at least these reasons. Allowance of independent Claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 18 and 20 depend directly from independent Claim 15, and include all of the limitations of that claim plus additional limitations that are not taught or suggested by the prior art. For instance, dependent Claim 18 provides that the tee time posting page serving step comprises the step of determining and displaying to the golf course via the golf course computer which tee times in the list of future tee times have previously been posted to the reservations hub. Similarly, dependent Claim 20 provides that the tee time posting page serving step comprises the step of serving a list of next-day tee times at the respective golf course. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claims 16, 18 and 20 are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the current rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**New Claims 31-35**

Claim 31 is added by this amendment. Independent Claim 31 is directed to a method of providing available golf tee times to prospective golfers that includes the steps of “a server

receiving a plurality of sets of available tee times submitted by multiple respective golf courses via a communications network,” and “the server storing the sets of available tee times for the multiple respective golf courses in a database.” Independent Claim 31 also includes the steps of “the server retrieving from the database the sets of available tee times at the multiple golf courses,” and “the server generating a web page that is executable by the golfer computer to display on one screen the sets of available tee times at the multiple respective golf courses.” As discussed with the Examiner, Linkstime does not teach or suggest any of these elements. Accordingly, applicant submits that independent Claim 31 is patentable over Linkstime for at least these reasons. Allowance of newly added independent Claim 31 is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-35 depend directly from independent Claim 31, and include all of the limitations of that claim plus additional limitations that are not taught or suggested by the prior art. For instance, dependent Claim 33 provides that at least one of the multiple golf courses submits a set of tee times representing less than all of the available tee times at the respective golf course. Similarly, dependent Claim 34 provides that the tee times displayed on said web page are next-day tee times at the respective golf courses. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claims 32-35 are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

#### New Claims 36-40

Independent Claim 36 is a system claim that corresponds generally to independent Claim 31, which is directed to a method. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above in regard to Claim 31, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 36 is patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of newly added independent Claim 36 is respectfully requested.

Claims 37-40 depend directly from independent Claim 36, and include all of the limitations of that claim plus additional limitations that are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claims 37-40 are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

**New Claims 41-45**

Claim 41 is added by this amendment. Independent Claim 41 is directed to a method of providing available golf tee times to prospective golfers that includes the steps of “a server receiving from a golfer computer via a communications network a request to access available golf tee times associated with a plurality of golf courses; the server retrieving from a database a set of available tee times for each of a plurality of golf courses;” and “the server generating a web page that is executable by the golfer computer to display on one screen the sets of available tee times at the plurality of respective golf courses.” Independent Claim 41 also includes the step of “the server transmitting the web page to the golfer computer via the communications network so that a prospective golfer can use the golfer computer to view said web page to select and reserve any of the displayed tee times.” As discussed with the Examiner, Linkstime does not teach or suggest any of these elements. Accordingly, applicant submits that independent Claim 41 is patentable over Linkstime for at least these reasons. Allowance of newly added independent Claim 41 is respectfully requested.

Claims 42-45 depend directly from independent Claim 41, and include all of the limitations of that claim plus additional limitations that are not taught or suggested by the prior art. For instance, dependent Claim 43 provides that at least one of the sets of available tee times for the respective golf courses is a set of tee times representing less than all of the available tee times at the respective golf course. Similarly, dependent Claim 45 provides that each of said multiple golf courses is located within a specific geographic region serviced by said server. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claims 42-45 are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

**New Claims 46-50**

Independent Claim 46 is a system claim that corresponds generally to independent Claim 41, which is directed to a method. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above in regard to Claim 41, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 46 is patentable over the prior art cited by the

Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of newly added independent Claim 46 is respectfully requested.

Claims 47-50 depend directly from independent Claim 46, and include all of the limitations of that claim plus additional limitations that are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claims 47-50 are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

**New Claims 51-55**

Claim 51 is added by this amendment. Independent Claim 51 is directed to a method of allowing a golf course to post available golf tee times that includes the steps of “a server receiving from a golf course computer via a communications network a request to receive a tee time posting web page,” and “in response to said web page request, the server transmitting a tee time posting web page to the golf course computer via the communications network.” Independent Claim 51 also includes the steps of “the server receiving the selected set of available tee times from the golf course computer of said golf course via the communications network,” and “the server storing the selected set of available tee times at said golf course in a database.” As discussed with the Examiner, Linkstime does not teach or suggest any of these elements. Accordingly, applicant submits that independent Claim 51 is patentable over Linkstime for at least these reasons. Allowance of newly added independent Claim 51 is respectfully requested.

Claims 52-55 depend directly from independent Claim 51, and include all of the limitations of that claim plus additional limitations that are not taught or suggested by the prior art. For instance, dependent Claim 53 provides that at least one of the sets of available tee times for the respective golf courses is a set of tee times representing less than all of the available tee times at the respective golf course. Similarly, dependent Claim 55 provides that the tee time posting web page includes an indication of which future tee times have previously been posted to the server by said golf course. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claims 52-55 are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

**New Claims 56-60**

Independent Claim 56 is a system claim that corresponds generally to independent Claim 51, which is directed to a method. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above in regard to Claim 51, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 56 is patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of newly added independent Claim 56 is respectfully requested.

Claims 57-60 depend directly from independent Claim 56, and include all of the limitations of that claim plus additional limitations that are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claims 57-60 are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant further submits with this amendment the additional fee and Fee Transmittal Form associated with the newly added claims included herein.

**Conclusion**

Claims 1-14, 17, 19 and 21-30 have been canceled and new claims 31-60 have been added with this Amendment. In view of the remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 15-16, 18 and 20, and new Claims 31-60 of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the subject application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number provided below.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Appl. No.: 09/802,367

Filed: March 9, 2001

Page 16

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen G. McNiff  
Registration No. 53,305

**Customer No. 00826**

**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**

Bank of America Plaza

101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000

Charlotte, NC 28280-4000


Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000

Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

"Express Mail" mailing label number EV 156375832 US

Date of Deposit August 27, 2004

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to: Mail Stop Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



Shelley Victoria